

New York Tribune

First to Last—The Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

TUESDAY, AUGUST 21, 1917

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York Corporation, Ogden Reid, President; G. Verne Rogers, Vice-President; Richard H. Waide, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address: Tribune Building, 154 Nassau street, New York. Telephone, BRekman 3609.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.50; 3 mos. \$4.50; 6 mos. \$8.00; 1 year, \$15.00.
Daily only, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$3.00; 6 mos. \$5.00; 1 year, \$9.00.
Sunday only, 1 mo. \$0.50; 3 mos. \$1.50; 6 mos. \$2.50; 1 year, \$4.50.

FOREIGN RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$2.50; 3 mos. \$7.50; 6 mos. \$12.50; 1 year, \$22.50.
Daily only, 1 mo. \$1.50; 3 mos. \$4.50; 6 mos. \$7.50; 1 year, \$13.50.
Sunday only, 1 mo. \$0.75; 3 mos. \$2.25; 6 mos. \$3.75; 1 year, \$6.75.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Why It Failed

The failure of the Pope's peace proposal—there can be no mistaking the fact that it has failed—is not difficult to explain. It has failed because it sought to prepare the way for a discussion between two sets of nations which are fighting a war on a wholly different basis. It failed beyond all else because the alliance against Germany is primarily an alliance to prevent the destruction of civilization by force. It failed because while the force to destroy remained in existence and the German will to use that force endured unshaken peace by negotiation was necessarily impossible.

If Great Britain were fighting solely to possess German colonies; if France had entered the war simply to regain Alsace-Lorraine; if Russia were animated merely by territorial ambition; if the United States had material objectives, then, on the present situation in the war, this would be an appropriate moment for discussion. But Russia entered the war to save Serbia, assailed by Austria; France entered the war because she was invaded, attacked; England entered the war because France was threatened with destruction and Belgium was invaded. The chief purpose of the English and the French and the Russians was to prevent Germany from dominating Europe by means that were abhorrent and for purposes destructive of European liberty.

The nations fighting Napoleon often made peace with their great enemy during the period in which Napoleonic ambition did not seek a Continental mastery, but when the nations of Europe recognized that temporary truces with Napoleon only invited new attacks, then they banded together and adopted as a platform the elimination of Napoleon as the necessary condition of peace. They proclaimed that they had no intention to dismember France, and at the end of a long war they left France substantially within the boundaries of 1789. Now the situation as to Germany is not different. It is impossible to make peace with a nation which regards war as an extension of policy and affirms the right to use military efficiency to promote national aspirations at the expense of neighbors. It is impossible to make peace when peace with such a nation means but a period in which new efficiency will be sought to make successful a new attack.

The difficulty with all negotiations and all proposals for peace now grows out of the fact that the real issue of the war is not concerned with territory, with colonies, with "places in the sun." The world has taken arms against Germany because the Germans have adopted a faith and a policy perilous to all the nations of the world and destined to remain perilous as long as it holds the German people and the German mind in thrall.

It is amazing to see how completely this condition has embodied itself in the minds of all the people of all the nations at war with Germany. No war weariness, no disappointment, no suffering, has failed to obscure the vision of the simple and plain people of the nations at war of this fact. If the Germans can do in Belgium what they have done and escape the consequences, then militarism is fastened upon the world, then we shall all have to take arms against the morrow when the German will come again, and without having conquered us, yet will have in fact condemned the world to adopt the German system and to live under German conditions.

The Germans entered this war as a man embarks upon an investment. A short fight, a speedy victory, a vast indemnity, new possessions—these were the lures that led the German on with 1870 fresh in his mind. Already the investment has proven a fatal error. Whatever happens, Germany can only harvest loss and she may be ruined. She will be ruined if she is not able now to escape a protraction of the war. She will be ruined more completely than any of the nations which are now fighting her, because greater burdens are laid upon her in proportion to her re-

sources than on any other nation, and her resources are absurdly disproportionate to the collective resources of the other nations. But so far as the Allies are concerned, they must fight until that ruin is achieved, unless the German renounces his policy—renounces his belief that war is an extension of policy defensible whenever it satisfies a German appetite.

There is not one single convincing sign that Germany has renounced her doctrines which precipitated this war, just as there is every possible evidence that she continues to employ the methods which made the war what it is. The German effort to seize European domination and world power has failed. The Germans are quite as well aware of this fact as their enemies. But they are very far from being convinced that it cannot succeed, and they are still able, as the published statements of German statesmen indicate, to cherish the idea that where there was failure this time there may be success again if mistakes made in 1914 are not repeated "next time."

The real obstacle to peace is Germany as she has revealed herself in this war. At the present moment and under the existing conditions it is hardly too much to say that this obstacle is insuperable. Were this war a war of the character of many of those contests of the past there is no nation in the world which would not have heeded the Pope's proposal to open negotiations for peace without further bloodshed. But this war is totally different from most, if not all, of the wars in the past, in that Germany precipitated it to seize control of the world and then pursued it with a remorselessness and inhuman efficiency which have threatened the life, the liberty and the safety of all her enemies, not alone through methods of civilized warfare, but by every method known to barbarism as well. And the world has quite unconsciously fixed upon one thing as the inevitable condition antecedent to any discussion of peace.

The first clear revelation of the German policy and purpose came in Belgium. As long as the Germans continue to argue about holding Belgium and refuse even to consider indemnifying and restoring Belgium, the whole civilized world has demonstrated that it cannot, both with regard to its moral obligations and its national safety, discuss peace with the German Empire. If the German government should to-morrow propose to make peace with the preliminary proposal to evacuate Belgium and to restore it, to discuss questions of Alsace-Lorraine and Italia Irredenta, with a recognition that there must be territorial concessions to close the centuries of rivalry; if Austria should agree to evacuate and indemnify Serbia as a condition preliminary to a discussion of world peace, then, and only then, would there be a dawning hope of the restoration of peace by negotiation.

But the world has palpably made up its mind that the first steps in the restoration of peace, if it is to come otherwise than by victory on the battlefield, must be a German proposal that, with respect to Belgium at least, carries with it a plain recognition of guilt for the past and to this extent at least a renunciation of that policy and those methods which have roused the world against Germany.

To-day Germany faces the dilemma of renouncing the policy and the faith which have brought the world in arms against her, or else of seeing her future ruined by the terrible burdens of the next year or two of war. And this is precisely the dilemma that the Allies have fought to put Germany in, and this is precisely the moment when for all future safety in the world the decision must be made by Germany, and peace negotiations can only follow such a decision as eliminates German policy.

We have come to one of the most interesting and critical moments of the whole war. Those in this country who are most ardently seeking to save Germany are most eager to assert that Germany is defeated and to argue that the defeat that she has suffered will cure her of the errors of the past. This is a pleasant but a specious argument. It is not to the German-Americans or to the German sympathizers in this country that Mr. Wilson and the government must turn for enlightenment. Peace is possible only when Germany herself takes the step which brings her back under the domain of civilization and international law and out of the utter darkness in which for three years she has travelled from crime to crime and from wrong to wrong.

The Pope's proposal has been one of the best things that have happened since the war began, because it has demonstrated the solidarity of the people allied against Germany so far as the essential principle at stake is concerned. They have declined to discuss peace because they have recognized that the war is not over and cannot be over until Germany has made that surrender, not of territory rightfully asked, not of colonies conquered by war, not even of provinces acquired by vicious methods in other times, but that surrender on the vital question of German necessity which led her into Belgium and into submarine

war—the question of the higher law invoked by the German whenever he had the power to seize and the appetite to desire that which belonged to his neighbor.

New York Goes to War

The invisible war became visible for a few hours yesterday morning, and New York gave about as good an imitation of enthusiasm as any croaker could ask to see. The 69th Regiment—as it will always be known to the city that loves and admires its fighting men—took away with it the memory of heartfelt cheers and a grateful people, eager to back it to the limit. For the first time, in a real sense, New York went to war.

Heretofore a curtain of mystery has been set against all interest in our departing soldiers. A consistent effort has apparently been made to reduce the war to a thing of blanks to fill out and boards to appear before, plus anonymous regiments arriving at unnamed ports. As a result the pessimists were presented with a chance to cry "Apathy!" and to assert that the country was not "enthusiastic" for the war. Just why a nation should be supposed to assemble on its highways and jump up and down and shout over nothing at all, these critics did not explain. The imputation remained, and all the country could do on its side was to perform the hard, uninteresting grind of the war—its Liberty Loan, its Red Cross, its conscription. This it has done with a will.

The episode of the 69th should furnish an example for the future. The good to the men and to the community is obvious. There is no danger, at this late date in a wearying war, of any cheap hullabaloo. All that is asked is that the people be permitted a chance to express their natural emotions toward their bravest and best men, setting out on the most heroic venture of our time.

Posterity in the Day Coach

If for statistical purposes it ever becomes necessary to determine offhand the marital status of the male population of a day coach, there is one simple and infallible device available. Bring in a single squalling infant. The married males will go on reading their newspapers or "Saturday Evening Post" quite as before. They will scarcely hear the heart-rending cries, though they be fit to drown the roar of the car wheels and the locomotive's shriek.

The bachelor will behave quite differently. He will begin by ignoring the uproar through an effort of the will as long as he can—say, a minute and a half. "With such petty and ignoble confusions of slavery what has a free and untrammelled citizen of the world to do?" his lifted eyebrows endeavor to publish. Then he begins to wriggle. He sets his teeth. He turns over his paper hurriedly. Control ceases. He wheels around and glares angrily at the squalling infant and its abominable parents. If his thoughts of the moment could be read they would sum up about as follows: "It may be necessary for the good of the world that posterity shall be hatched and incubated and brought to manhood and womanhood, but why in the name of comfort and decency must posterity be reared on a railroad train?" His thoughts are, in fact, so summed up in one wrathful, withering look.

We have participated in efforts to expound the defence, such as it is, of the squalling infant in the day coach. Infants are human and have rights. They must occasionally be moved, to be taken to doctors, to grandparents, to vacations for a change of air, and what not. All parents have not limousines in which to transfer their offspring, and bachelors volunteer their limousines for such purposes with astonishing infrequency. And the arguer's children never cry, anyway. And so on. But the effort is quite in vain. The guilt on the parent and the non-parent is one of those unbridgeable chasms which are so common in society. No imagination can leap it, sympathy halts at the brink.

To any parent, however crabbed, any red faced, tear stained, dirty, yowling brat is an object at least of humorous endurance. In the spirit of the connoisseur he may even go further and admire the lung power indicated. He can always add a chuckle of relief that it is not his offspring that is offending and that he is not embarrassedly manipulating a bottle or a watch fob in a vain effort to curb the unruly infant. He never gets to damning.

Whether the day coach, with its inevitable infants, is good for the bachelor we do not pretend to decide. It may engender a hatred of offspring which prevents how many marriages! It may stir a sense of revenge, a wish to propagate posterity of one's own to make life in day coaches that much more hideous. It may possibly stir occasionally an envy of the calm parent who can sit contentedly in the midst of such alarms. The day coach rolls on, in any event, bearing posterity with it. Bachelors are a fly upon the track; their emotions or their fate nature can imagine nothing of less consequence.

The Senators from Missouri

Illinois is properly the subject of gibes and reproaches on account of some of its Representatives in Congress—notably Representative Mason—and also because of certain words and actions of the Mayor of the principal city of the state. This is not the only state, however that in a time of special peril and strain furnishes contributions to the nation's menagerie of political freaks. There are Missouri. Its two Senators—Stone and Reed—have come to near by a total loss to the Republic in this emergency as any brace of Senators in the entire show. The reasons that actuate Senators Stone and Reed in resorting to violent attacks upon the food control bill and upon Mr. Hoover personally may be difficult to fathom or they may not. Opinions differ on this subject. It is fair to assume, however, that somewhere in the backs of their craniums lurks the fixed idea that political advantage will come to them from their bushwhacking activities. Fortunately, American politics furnishes many painful surprises for politicians of this type.

"No!"

The Tribune's Comment on the Papal Peace Terms Discussed

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: May I thank you for your leader in to-day's paper—"No!" It voices the indignant thought of all souls who care for righteousness and see the stern demands of justice above all mere expediencies and compromises with infamous crimes.

That the crimes of Germany and Turkey in particular are on a scale so gigantic as to throw all past infamies into the shade is no reason why they should go unpunished and even suggested, as the Pope's letter to the world suggests. That scale of cruelty and savage barbarism only makes it more imperatively the duty of the Allies to bring these awful crimes to sternest judgment. The letter of His Holiness disregards justice absolutely. All virtues are practically worthless unless based on the fundamental virtue, justice.

To accept the Pope's letter as a basis for peace would make Christianity a cowardly force and disgrace Christendom forever. It is the most amazing thing that has yet come upon a world more or less dazed by the German denials of every law of God and man and every victory won in blood and anguish for justice in this present world.
New York, Aug. 17, 1917. F. B. NASH.

A Strong Move for Germany

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Your characterization of the Pope's peace proposal is correct. His Holiness is three years and some days too late. He should, at the outset, have taken his favorite and dear "child," Austria, by the scruff of the neck and the seat of the trousers and have told him to go away back to Berlin with his (the Austrian) gentle peace proposal to Serbia, sit down and think it over.

There is no record of any protest by the Pope to Austria on account of Austria's outrageous and humiliating and un-Christian ultimatum to Serbia. The numerous and barbarous and clearly evident crimes of Germany have likewise echoed vainly in the papal hall of silence. The helpless infants and women and unarmed men of the Lusitania—all children of the Holy Father—went to their ocean burial without the last rites of the Church. Cardinal Mercier, doubtless, has disclosed to the Pope the horrid details of Catholic Belgium's rape, robbery and murder. "This thing was not done in a corner."

But the Pope either has not used the opportunity that has been his to find out for himself the truth, or else he has willed to close his eyes and ears to evidence that has been clear and plain to the whole world. In either case his judgment and counsel in regard to this war are valueless, no matter how much respect may be had for his office. In the face of all that Germany has done—putting aside for the nonce the question of responsibility for the war's beginning—neutral judgment on the Pope's part is not neutral, but biased; his suggestion is for nothing more nor less than a compromise.

This, as all the world knows—none better than Germany—would be a decided German victory and the beginning of another and more terrible war. This is a weak move on the Pope's part, but a strong move for Germany; it will fail, because a righteous God, not the Pope, rules this world.

AMERICAN.
Haledon, N. J., Aug. 16, 1917.

Squarely on the Head

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: You have struck the nail squarely on the head. Permit me to voice the sentiments of millions of people in indorsement of your leader this morning on the proposed abandonment of Belgium, as suggested in the peace message of His Holiness the Pope of Rome. These are your words:

It is conceivable that the Belgian people, thus deserted by Great Britain and France, thus deserted by all the great powers of the world, would again intensify their struggle against Germany. Would any small people in this world, with the Belgian atrocity in their mind, with the desertion of Belgium proposed in the present peace terms, ever resist a strong invader or oppose might in the hope and in the faith that aid would come from without?

The answer to this is "No," they certainly would not. And the suggestion is this—that, if peace terms of the kind proposed are to follow such wars as we now have, the logical attitude of Belgium in 1914 should have been an immediate consolidation with the German Empire. Had this been done, Belgium, with the help of Germany, would have been safe, and Germany and Belgium would have made the war a very different affair for England and France. Holland and Denmark would have joined the German allies and the dream of North Sea empire would have become a reality. The lesson of such a peace policy as that proposed would be that in time of war small peoples must join the large and stronger ones or perish.

FREDERICK W. PANGBORN.
New York, Aug. 17, 1917.

That These Policies Shall Not Be Enacted Again

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Your editorial of August 16 is couched in such plain and forcible terms, so logical and applicable to the subject discussed therein, that it deserves more than a passing notice of its contents. Stripped of every semblance of sophistry and misconception, and aiming only at the facts and principles involved in the subject of a peace based on a valid and righteous conclusion, it certainly sweeps away all chance of a peace based on intrigue, and one patched up for the purpose of gaining an advantage to repeat that which has stirred the nations of the present time and caused inconceivable misery and threatened the rights and liberties of the entire race of mankind.

I am glad that your vision is unclouded, and that you look not through a glass darkly, but face to face with the facts as they exist to an unprejudiced mind. Those atrocities which have characterized the German policies in this war, as you say, "Do not cry for vengeance. But they are eloquent voices crying that these policies shall not be enacted again, and that the end of this war shall bring the death sentence to the idea which was expressed in them."

The question whether this nation and her allies shall be dominated by one man power and made the doormat for future generations to trample underfoot, and made to surrender the God-given rights and liberties bequeathed to the fathers and sons of the republics who have fought for and achieved all the blessings that make life worth living, is now in the balance, and our best blood cries for a freedom imperishable and undimmed.

DAVID EASON.
Elizabethtown, Penn., Aug. 17, 1917.

Hearty Thanks

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Permit me, a professional student of history and the classics and an amateur student of philosophy, to express my unfeigned approval and hearty thanks for your masterly editorial in this morning's issue of The Tribune, "No!"
Could it not be reprinted in pamphlet form and distributed broadcast?
ERNEST D. DANIELS.
Brooklyn, Aug. 17, 1917.

Against Group Insurance

By F. Spencer Baldwin, Manager State Insurance Fund

May I have space for a few words of comment on the contribution to your editorial page of August 15 by George Clarke Cox, Ph. D., on "Group Insurance for Soldiers"?

It is difficult for a lay reader to discern the exact purpose or reason d'être of this contribution. It is of the species of academic criticism that leaves one at the end vaguely in doubt as to what it is all about. Apparently the writer sets out to criticize the proposed system of government insurance and family allowance for soldiers and sailors on the ground of expense, but in the end he comes forward with a proposal that the government provide free group insurance for the men serving in the army and navy, a much more radical and expensive proposal than the plan embodied in the Administration bill, which provides simply for the sale of life insurance at net cost.

The Government Measure
It may be of interest to explain briefly the three main features of the government measure under discussion. The plan provides, in the first place, for family allowance to dependents of enlisted men in amounts graduated, according to the size of the family, from \$5 to \$50 a month. Allotments of pay are to be made as contributions toward the family allowance—compulsory as to wife and children and voluntary as to other persons—the amount of the allotment ranging from a minimum of \$15 a month to a maximum of one-half the pay. In case one-half of an enlisted man's pay is not allotted, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy may require that any portion of one-half of the pay that is not allotted shall be deposited to his credit, to be held during such period as may be prescribed and paid back, with interest at 5 per cent, to the enlisted man or his beneficiaries or next of kin.

The second feature of the plan covers compensation for death or disability, according to the usual method of workmen's compensation legislation. The amount of compensation is graduated according to the amount of pay and the number and status of dependents, the maximum monthly compensation for death and for total disability being fixed at \$200. A most important provision of this part of the plan requires the injured men to follow such courses of rehabilitation, reeducation and vocational training as the government may prescribe, with the view to restoring them to self-supporting employment, upon the penalty of suspension of payment of compensation for willful failure to comply with this requirement. In the case of a man who recovers his earning power, in part or in whole, in order that there may be no loss of incentive to make the best of all opportunities for rehabilitation. Failure to make a proper effort to recover lost or impaired earning power is thus penalized, while success in attaining this end is rewarded.

A Comprehensive Plan
The third division of the plan authorizes the sale of life insurance to enlisted men by the government, in amounts not less than \$1,000 or more than \$10,000, at absolute net cost. The government is to bear the expense of administration and the additional cost resulting from the war hazard. Application for this insurance must be made within 120 days after enlistment or entrance into active service and before discharge or resignation, except that men in active service at the time of the publication of the terms and conditions of the proposed contract of insurance may apply at any time within 120 days after that date.

This comprehensive plan provides protection for enlisted men with respect to the three main risks attendant upon military service. These are, first, the risk of loss of occupation or earnings, and the consequent hardship to dependents during the period of service; second, the risk of loss of life or limb, with resulting dependency for the man himself or the members of his family; third, the risk of non-insurability at ordinary rates, which every enlisted man incurs by reason of entry into military service. These are heavy and serious risks which enlistment and draft impose upon the man, who is undertaking them of his own free will, as well as just and proper that this burden should not be thrown upon the individual, but should be assumed and borne collectively by the people as a whole.

Toadstools

Fabre's Experiments on Behalf of the Frugal Housekeeper

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: In your issue of August 16 one of your correspondents, under the heading, "A Neglected Cheap Food," expresses the wish that some philanthropic scientist would push the use of mushrooms and the many other species of edible fungi.

A reference to "Souvenirs Entomologiques" of J. H. Fabre at the article "Insectes et Champignons" will show that one of the greatest of scientists has endeavored to push the use not only of mushrooms, but also of toadstools, as being, under proper conditions, a nutritious and perfectly safe article of human diet. He states that the most violently poisonous varieties of toadstools are rendered innocuous if they are thoroughly boiled for a short time in water in which a pinch of bicarbonate of soda is dissolved, and afterward rinsed in cold water—their substance and flavor and even their aroma are in no way affected, and they are then ready to be dressed and served in the same manner as mushrooms, from which they cannot easily be distinguished.

Fabre says that from time immemorial toadstools, harmless or violently poisonous, have been gathered indiscriminately, boiled and eaten with impunity by the peasants of Provence, where he lived, forming, in fact, during their season, one of the chief staples of daily food. At his own table they were frequently served and enjoyed by himself, his family and his guests.

Fabre gave this subject the patient and scrupulous care with which he observed every secret of nature, and sums up his reason for doing so as follows:
"I had in view not the epicure, but the frugal man, the toiler in the fields above all, and would consider myself repaid for my persevering research could I in any degree popularize this prudent Provencal recipe for the cooking of toadstools that form such an excellent food and agreeable addition to the daily ration of beans and potatoes. If only one knows how to get over the difficulty of having to distinguish between the harmless and dangerous varieties." These words of Fabre recur to me recently when on a visit to the Jersey shore I saw the ground under the pines thick with puff balls, some nearly as large as melons. I asked one of the poor, underfed natives why they did not gather and eat them. "Oh, we ain't going to run no risks," he answered.

Now, I have been told by an eminent American scientist that there is not a single variety of puff ball in the United States that is not perfectly good to eat, and I have often seen them myself, without the precaution of gathering and boiling, since in their case it is unnecessary, yet the half-starved Jerseyman did not dare. What a waste, and what a pity!
M. WILLIS.
New York, Aug. 16, 1917.

The Pope Mistranslated

His Peace Message Was Reduced to Gibberish in English

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Who is responsible for the farago of unintelligible and ill-punctuated nonsense given out as the "official translation" of the Pope's message? Presumably the original was written in French, unless the Vatican ignored the customary use of that language in diplomatic intercourse and preferred to use Italian, but both here and in England there are thousands of men proficient in either or both of these languages; why, then, should the task of producing an "official translation" be entrusted to some dunderhead whose ignorance of them is only equalled by his inability even to use intelligible English?

Take, for example, the opening sentence, "Since the beginning of our Pontificate the horrors of a terrible war let loose on Europe, we had in view above everything three things to preserve." Does this mean that the beginning of our Pontificate let loose the horrors of a terrible war? Or does it mean, "Since the beginning of our Pontificate the horrors of a terrible war have been let loose"? And consider the masterly English of the expression, "We had in view above everything three things to preserve." In the next sentence, "Our pacific mission requires to omit nothing as long as it was in our power which might contribute to hasten the end," etc. How delightful the idiom, "requires to omit"! Or should there be at least a comma after "requires"—i. e., should the sentence read, "Finally—our pacific mission also requires—to omit nothing?"

A few lines further on we read, "In such a terrible situation . . . we, who have no particular political aim, who do not listen to suggestions . . . but are solely compelled by a sentiment of our supreme duty, etc. . . . and there the sentence ends, with "we" hanging in the air.

Next we come to this charming paragraph: "Through the voice even of humanity and reason we once more emit the cry of peace." What is the meaning of "even"? What is the meaning of the phrase, "to emit a cry of peace through the voice of humanity"? One is inclined to "emit a cry" of bewilderment. Again we find, "The fundamental points must be that the material force of arms must be substituted by the moral force of right." What are fundamental points? The two words are contradictory: points cannot be fundamental. And what authority is there for "substituted by"? Supplanted by or superseded by would be permissible, but not substituted by.

The next sentence, ". . . then in the substitution for armies the institution of arbitration" (by which I conclude is meant "in the institution of arbitration as a substitute for armed force"), is also left hanging in the air with no beginning and no end. What could be more asinine balderdash than the next sentence, "Once the supremacy of right has thus been established, all obstacles . . . would disappear . . . by assuring . . . the true liberty and community of the seas, which would contribute to the numerous causes of conflict and would also open to all new sources of prosperity." I defy even the most painstaking investigator to make head or tail of this sentence. Apparently the community of the seas is some way or other contributes to the causes of conflict and, if so, how does it open up sources of prosperity?

Once more, "Therefore, in presenting to you, direct to this hour the destinies of the benighted nations, we are animated to see them accepted." In presenting what? One concludes, of course, that some words such as "these proposals" have been omitted, but, even so, what English grammarian ever permitted such a cacophony as "we are animated to see them accepted"? If the British Foreign Office is responsible for this gibberish would it not be possible to convey to it some hint that it should reorganize its translating force? If I remember right, the English press complained bitterly about the translation of some of the Foreign Office and other nations at the beginning of the war. I took the trouble to compare a good many of them with the originals in French and found hardly one correctly translated. Possibly you could stir up the English press to make another protest.

J. ACTON LOMAX.
New York, Aug. 18, 1917.

The Fate of Poland

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: According to the text of Pope Benedict's plea for peace made public by Washington, his holiness, after soliciting the learning of the questions of Alsace-Lorraine and Italia Irredenta to the peace conference for examination, pleads the same for Armenia, the Balkan States and Poland.

Thus does the holy father dispose of the vital question of the destiny of Poland—Poland which has suffered persecution for more than a century at the hands of Prussia, Austria and Russia for her nationality, and at the hands of Prussia and Russia for her Catholic faith; thus is the case of Poland disposed of for the sake of "peace" by the successor of Innocent XI, whose nephew, Pius VI, when Austria and all Christendom were menaced with Moslem subjugation, fell on his knees before John Sobieski on August 5, 1683 and cried: "King, save Christendom!"

The service of Poland in preserving the integrity of the Hapsburg monarchy was repaid less than a century later by participation in the dismemberment of Poland; while Western Europe, through Poland's chivalry, escaped Moslem conquest, made no move to prevent the dissection of the "night among nations"; and now the head of the Church of which Poland has always been a devoted daughter urges that her fate should be the subject of subsequent negotiation, proposes merely an "examination" of her case and consigns her to the "sympathies" of the diplomatic diplomats that will gather at the bargaining table of the peace conference, doubtless to the certain veto by Germany and Austria of her just claims.

What a blighting of hopes not only for the sons of "Polonia semper libera," but also for all lovers of justice who had been cheered by the cable message made public on the 10th by the French Bureau of Information in New York, quoting Monsignor Tedeschi, Papal Under Secretary of State, as declaring for a "peace of justice," including the restoration of a free Poland, the restoration of Alsace-Lorraine to France and of Italia Irredenta to Italy, and the unification of Rumania!
WACLAU PERKOWSKI.
New York, Aug. 19, 1917.

"The Law of Treason"

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Please accept my thanks for your "Law of Treason" in to-day's paper. It is the most complete and comprehensive essay on the subject I have read in some thirty-five years of reading on law subjects. It should be printed in every newspaper in the country more than once, and especially in the German-American papers. W. G. C.
Norwalk, Conn., Aug. 17, 1917.